



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

HN
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/038,978	01/04/2002	Adam Roach	1005-0013	9505
27045	7590	09/20/2005		
ERICSSON INC.			EXAMINER	
6300 LEGACY DRIVE			NGUYEN, VAN H	
M/S EVR C11				
PLANO, TX 75024			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2194	

DATE MAILED: 09/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/038,978	ROACH ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	VAN H. NGUYEN	2194

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 June 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,2,4-9,11-13 and 15-19 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 3,10 and 14 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-19 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. **Claims 17-19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by **Ejzak et al.** (U.S. 6,781,070 B2).

4. **As to claim 17**, Ejzak teaches (*see fig.3 and the accompanying text beginning at col.10, line 16*) the invention as claimed including an architecture for a communications node in a Session Initiation Protocol telecommunications network (*SIP*), the node performing a plurality of call-control functions (*functions of CSCF*), and being implemented on a single physical platform (*a single physical entity*), the architecture comprising:

a plurality of application-specific logic blocks, each of the application-specific logic blocks performing application-level logic corresponding to one of the plurality of call-control functions (*see fig.3 and the accompanying text beginning at col.10, line 16*);

a plurality of SIP function blocks for performing SIP behavior-handling functions common to plurality of call-control functions (*the Serving-CSCF (S-CSCF)… session control point… the interrogating CSCF (I-CSCF)… contact point in to the home network… the a proxy CSCF (P-CSCF)… contact point into IMS; col.10, lines 26-38*);

means for selectively interfacing the SIP functional blocks with selected application-specific logic blocks (*see fig.1 and the BGCF discussion beginning at col.4, line 26*) wherein selected combinations of SIP functional blocks and application-specific logic blocks are operable to perform selected ones of the call-control functions (*see fig.3 and the accompanying text beginning at col.10, line 16*); and

an operating system supporting all of the SIP functional blocks and application-specific logic blocks (*within a particular network some or all of the logical roles may be combined into a single physical entity… CSCF 143 performs one or more the following roles… can act as the Serving-CSCF… can also serve as the interrogating CSCF… can serve as a proxy CSCF ; col.10, lines 16-37*).

5. As to claim 18, Ejzak teaches means for mapping into groups, the plurality of application-specific logic blocks and the plurality of SIP function blocks, each of the groups defining a different one of the plurality of call-control functions performed by the node (*see fig.3 and the accompanying text beginning at col.10, line 16*).

6. As to claim 19, Ejzak teaches each of the plurality application-specific logic blocks performs application-level logic corresponding to a call control function selected from, among other things, a Proxy Call State Control Function (*a Proxy Call State Control Function; col. 10, lines 34-35*).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made

(b) This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

8. **Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-13, 15, and 16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Ejzak et al.** in view of **Faccin et al.** (Pub. No.: US 2002/0120729 A1).

9. **As to claim 1**, the rejection of claim 17 above is incorporated herein in full. Ejzak, however, does not specifically teach at least one mapping table.

Faccin teaches at least one mapping table (*a mapping table; see paras. 0032 and 0126*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teachings of Faccin with Ejzak because Faccin's teachings would have provided the capability for efficiently selecting an appropriate SIP procedure, such as a serving call state control function, an interrogating call state control function, or a proxy call state control function to provide a required service, therefore, enabling home control of all services.

10. As to claim 2, Faccin teaches the mapping table includes groups of network addresses for application-specific logic blocks and for functional blocks in the engine module (*see paras. 0032 and 0126*), each of the groups of addresses identifying a selected application-specific logic block (*paras. 0088-0093*) and at least one functional block in the engine module that together perform the call-control function corresponding to the selected application-specific logic block (*see paras. 0111-0118*).

11. As to claim 4, Ejzak teaches the telecommunications network utilizes call-control signaling based on the Session Initiation Protocol (*see col.3, lines 16-23*); and the plurality of application-specific logic blocks include logic blocks for a Call State Control Function (*see fig.3 and the Call State Control Function discussion beginning at col.10, line 16*).

12. As to claim 5, Ejzak teaches a plurality of SIP behavior functions and a SIP stack that performs reliability and error-checking functions associated with signal communications with the communications node (*see the CSCF discussion beginning at col.10, line 16*).

13. As to claim 6, Ejzak teaches the plurality of SIP behavior functions includes a proxy function (*a Proxy Call State Function; see fig.3*), a User Agent Server function (*Serving CSCF; see fig.3*), and a User Agent Client function (*Interrogating CSCF; see fig.3*).

14. As to claim 7, Ejzak teaches at least one of the application-level logic blocks includes a Registrar SIP behavior function (*SIP-level Registration; col.11, lines 1-6*).

15. As to claim 8, Ejzak teaches the SIP stack includes a plurality of portable units, the portable units including: a transaction manager; a parser; and a utility package (*see fig.4 and the accompanying text beginning at col.12, line 19*).

16. **As to claim 9**, the rejections of claims 1 and 17 above are incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Ejzak further teaches (*see fig.3 and the accompanying text beginning at col.10, line 16*):

an application-level logic block corresponding to the P-CSCF (*P-CSCF*);
an application-level logic block corresponding to the I-CSCF (*I-CSCF*);
an application-level logic block corresponding to the S-CSCF (*S-CSCF*); and
a plurality of SIP behavior functions and a plurality of SIP stack functions (*the functions of CSCF*); selected SIP behavior functions and selected SIP stack functions being operable to perform the functions of a P-CSCF, I-CSCF, or S-CSCF when interfaced with an appropriate application-specific logic block corresponding to the P-CSCF, I-CSCF, or S-CSCF (*CSCF 143 performs one or more the following roles...can act as the Serving-CSCF...can also serve as the interrogating CSCF....can serve as a proxy CSCF ; col.10, lines 16-37*).

17. As to claims 11 and 12, they include the same limitations as claims 6 and 7 above, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

18. **As to claim 13**, the rejections of claims 1 and 17 above are incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Ejzak further teaches assigning a network logic-block address to each of the

application-specific logic blocks (*col.4, lines 46-65*); assigning a network address to each of the SIP stack functions and call-control behavior functions (*col.12, lines 59-67*).

19. As to claims 15 and 16, they include the same limitations as claims 6 and 7 above, and are similarly rejected under the same rationale.

Allowable Subject Matter

20. Claims 3, 10, and 14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

21. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

22. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Foti et al. (US 6917612 B2) teaches "System and method for address resolution in internet protocol (IP)-based networks"

- Requena (US 6904035 B2) teaches “Mobile system, terminal and interface, as well as methods for providing backward compatibility to first and second generation mobile systems”

- Bharatia et al. (US 6763233 B2) teaches “Terminal roaming operations between intergenerational wireless networks”

- Faccin et al. (US 6725036 B1) teaches “System and method of controlling application level access of a subscriber to a network”

- Foti et al. (US 6654606 B1) teaches “Call state control function (CSCF) call processing”

- Foti et al. (US 6546247 B1) teaches “Home location server and call processing method in a hybrid second/third generation radio telecommunications network”

23. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

24. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2194

25. Any inquiry or a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: (571) 272-2100.

26. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VAN H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571) 272-3765. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM - 6:00PM. The examiner can also be reached on alternative Friday.

27. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng-Ai An can be reached on (571) 272-3756.

28. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

29. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for patents
P O Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

VHN


MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNICAL CENTER 2100